1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Northern District of California

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNI	A

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Plaintiff,

v.

SUNITHA GUNTIPALLY,

Defendant.

Case No. 16-cr-00189-JSC-1

ORDER RE: MOTION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPEALABILITY

Re: Dkt. No. 456

Before the Court is Defendant Sunitha Guntipally's motion for certificate of appealability of this Court's order denying her motion to vacate, set aside or correct her sentence pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2255. (Dkt. No. 456; see Dkt. No. 455.)¹ "A certificate of appealability may issue . . . only if the applicant has made a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2). "The petitioner must demonstrate that reasonable jurists would find the district court's assessment of the constitutional claims debatable or wrong." Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000).

Ms. Guntipally's interpretation of ITServe Alliance, Inc. v. Cissna, 443 F. Supp. 3d 14, 38– 43 (D.D.C. 2020), is not reasonable. ITServe held that USCIS's rules requiring proof of nonspeculative work assignments and corresponding itineraries exceeded its rulemaking authority. That does not change the standard for whether Ms. Guntipally's fraudulent statements to USCIS were material to its decisions on H-1B visa applications. (See Dkt. No. 455 at 4–5.) Applicants are required to be truthful regardless of whether USCIS can require employers to provide certain kinds of proof. (See Dkt. No. 165 at 3-4 (plea agreement).) Nor does ITServe conflict with

¹ Record citations are to material in the Electronic Case File ("ECF") for Case No. 16-cr-00189-JSC-1; pinpoint citations are to the ECF-generated page numbers at the top of the documents.

Case 3:16-cr-00189-JSC Document 457 Filed 07/15/22 Page 2 of 2

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28

United States District Court Northern District of California

United States v. Leonti, 326 F.3d 1111, 1116 (9th Cir. 2003), which generally explains when the states v. Leonti, 326 F.3d 1111, 1116 (9th Cir. 2003), which generally explains when the states v. Leonti, 326 F.3d 1111, 1116 (9th Cir. 2003), which generally explains when the states v. Leonti, 326 F.3d 1111, 1116 (9th Cir. 2003), which generally explains when the states v. Leonti, 326 F.3d 1111, 1116 (9th Cir. 2003), which generally explains when the states v. Leonti, 326 F.3d 1111, 1116 (9th Cir. 2003), which generally explains when the states v. Leonti, 326 F.3d 1111, 1116 (9th Cir. 2003), which generally explains when the states v. Leonti, 326 F.3d 1111, 1116 (9th Cir. 2003), which generally explains when the states v. Leontine	nen ar
evidentiary hearing on a Section 2255 motion is required.	

Accordingly, Ms. Guntipally has not demonstrated that this Court's assessment of her constitutional claims is debatable or wrong. The motion is DENIED.

This Order disposes of Docket No. 456.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: July 15, 2022

ACQUELINE SCOTT CORLECT United States District Judge